



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/772,759	02/04/2004	Phillip L. Lam	PERFECT-1/CIP	5694
1054	7590	12/26/2007	EXAMINER	
LEONARD TACHNER, A PROFESSIONAL LAW CORPORATION 17961 SKY PARK CIRCLE, SUITE 38-E IRVINE, CA 92614			MICHALSKI, SEAN M	
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3724				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/26/2007		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

ED

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/772,759	LAM, PHILLIP L.
	Examiner Sean M. Michalski	Art Unit 3724

- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address -

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 May 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 19 and 29-32 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 19 and 29-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2)<input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3)<input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4)<input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____. 5)<input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application 6)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: <u>NPL "Parmley" (2 pages)</u>.
--	--

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 5/14/2007 has been entered **IN ACCORDANCE with the petition decision mailed 11/28/2007.**

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b, a and e) as being anticipated by Carr (US 6,560,876; USPGPUB 2002/0194735).

Carr discloses an appliance capable of manicuring having a cutting implement comprising an elongated member having first and second ends (10 figure 1), on the first end having a proximal member (13) which is releasable (column 2 lines 39-44). The proximal member (cartridge) has a first and second end including a guard and a 'flat portion' respectively (in figure 3, the 'flat portion is clearly seen at the back of the razor cartridge, and the guard can be clearly seen in front of the two blades), with two blades

positioned therebetween, and a distal member coupled to the second end of the elongated member (14 figure 1).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 29-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carr in view of Lipp et al. (US 6,779,942) as further evidenced by Parmley, R.O. ("Illustrated Sourcebook of Mechanical Components").

Carr does not teach the releasable cartridges of the proximal and distal members to have a pair of probes, and the elongated handle to have a pair of apertures. Carr is silent as to the connection means of the cartridges, allowing one of ordinary skill to select any known connection means in accordance with common sense.

Lipp teaches an elongated member 16 having a pair of probes each having securing tabs, which fits into a hollow cavity (20) of a member (22), and having apertures (36, and another –column 3 line 60) for receiving the securing tabs.

Examiner takes official notice of the fact that a tab and aperture configuration is a simple common connection and is fully appreciated by one of ordinary skill in the art. See as evidence Parmley, R.O. 9-12 and 9-13 which shows the level of sophistication one of ordinary skill in the art possesses in regards to using snap fasteners, a conventional and widely used connection technique.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a connection wherein a pair of probes each having a pair of securing tabs was disposed in a hollow cavity having a pair of apertures for receiving the pair of securing tabs, as is known in the art as a way to connect two elements, such as a razor handle and cartridge. It has been held that the combination of elements known in the prior art to be used in accordance with their known functions *is unpatentable as a matter of law* absent a showing that the combination has results which are *unexpectedly* advantageous over the prior art. Please see *Sakraida v. Ag Pro, Inc.* U.S. Supreme Court No. 75-110 425 US 273, 189 USPQ 449 (1976), Which states “patent[s] for combination that only unites old elements with no change in their respective functions withdraws what is already known into field of its monopoly and diminishes resources available to skillful men” and [a] patent [which] simply arranges old elements with each performing the same function it had been known to perform, although perhaps producing a more striking result than in previous combinations...are not patentable under standards appropriate for a combination patent”; also see *Anderson’s Black Rock, Inc. v. Pavement Salvage Co., Inc.* U.S. Supreme Court 396 US 57, 163 USPQ 673 (1969) which states “while the combination of old elements performed a useful function, it added nothing to the nature and quality of the radiant-heat burner already patented”. Similarly here, securing via probes with securing tabs in a hollow cavity is known.

The Supreme Court in *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc. et al.* No. 04-1350, 550 U.S. ____ (2007) affirmed both Sakraida and Anderson’s requirement that to be

patentable a combination needed to provide some synergistic effect. See Slip op. at 13 lines 3-19. Using known elements for their known functions is as a *matter of law not patentable*, since it removes resources available to skillful men, contrary to U.S. Const., Art. I §8, cl.8. which provides patent monopolies to promote the progress of useful arts. See Slip op. KSR at 24 lines 5-7.

Each of the elements proximal member, distal member and connections (including probes, securing tabs, a hollow cavity and apertures) are known as seen in the cited prior art (above); their combination is unpatentable absent a showing that one of ordinary skill would be unable to effect their combination, or their combination provides unexpectedly good results (more than a duplicated effect). The fact that in Lipp the probes are shown on the elongated member and the hollow cavity is shown on another member is irrelevant, since the reversal of parts has consistently been held to be *routine, within the level of ordinary skill in the art* and *prima facie obvious* (unless a showing is made that one of ordinary skill would have been incapable of effecting the reversal). See *In re Einstein*, 8 USPQ 167 which held that a mere reversal of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sean M. Michalski whose telephone number is 571-272-6752. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30AM - 3:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Boyer Ashley can be reached on 571-272-4502. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SMM



KENNETH E. PETERSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER